

Charles E. Schumer, Catherine Cortez Masto, Gary C. Peters, Elizabeth Warren, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeff Merkley, Christopher A. Coons, Patty Murray, Amy Klobuchar, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Martin Heinrich, Jon Ossoff, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jayme Ray White, of Washington, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Western Hemisphere, Europe, the Middle East, Labor, and Environment), with the rank of Ambassador, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 78, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 371 Ex.]

#### YEAS—78

Baldwin	Graham	Portman
Barrasso	Grassley	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Risch
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Hoeven	Sasse
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Burr	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Scott (SC)
Capito	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Lummis	Stabenow
Cassidy	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Thune
Coons	McConnell	Tillis
Cornyn	Menendez	Toomey
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cramer	Moran	Warner
Crapo	Murkowski	Warnock
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Ernst	Ossoff	Wicker
Fischer	Padilla	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	Young

#### NAYS—20

Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Paul
Braun	Inhofe	Rubio
Cotton	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Kennedy	Shelby
Daines	Lankford	Sullivan
Hagerty	Lee	Tuberville
Hawley	Marshall	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein Rounds

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The yeas are 78, the nays are 20.

The motion is agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jayme Ray White, of Washington, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Western Hemisphere, Europe, the Middle East, Labor, and Environment), with the Rank of Ambassador.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the votes in relation to the White and Pan nominations occur at 6:30 p.m. tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there will be one rollcall vote at 2:45 p.m. today. That vote will be on the confirmation of the Batchelder nomination. There will be two rollcall votes at 6:30 p.m. tonight. Those will be on the confirmation of the White nomination and cloture on the Pan nomination.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SOCIALISM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, paraphrasing a philosopher of his era, Winston Churchill once said: Those that fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

And I doubt that Churchill was the only one that said that. I think we quote other people saying similar things.

Now, Churchill was himself a devoted student to history. The research for his multivolume biography of his ancestor, John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, likely informed his strategic military thinking as Prime Minister during World War II.

Churchill was also a fierce critic of socialism in his time, and that is the main point of my remarks today—talking about socialism.

Socialism, as we know it today, is based on a different view of history than what Churchill had, a history that says we are headed in a particular direction, and you just need to see where it is heading to “be on the right side of history.”

Socialism was thought to be the wave of the future in Churchill’s time, just as it was the wave of the future when Karl Marx was writing about it in the mid-1800s. In fact, a wave is an apt analogy for socialism. Enthusiasm for socialism has crested and then crashed down many, many times in the last couple of centuries.

Today, some enthusiasts are again riding high on this socialism wave. Some of them are too young to know better, while others simply refuse to learn the lessons from the previous crashes that socialism has shown us.

Given previous spectacular failures of full-fledged socialism in Eastern Europe, Latin America, Asia, and Africa, usually, as we learn, resulting in violence, in poverty, and, most importantly, suppression of individual rights that we value here in the United States, but also advocates of socialism find themselves on the defensive once again.

When asked why we should try a system that has repeatedly and spectacularly failed, a common fallback is to cite Sweden and other Nordic countries as examples that we should learn from.

It may surprise some of my colleagues here in the Senate that this is one point where I agree with the socialists. We should examine and learn from Sweden’s experience. In fact, an excellent summary of Sweden’s experience from the 1950s to this very day has been compiled by the Swedish economist Johan Norberg. His video, which goes by the title “Sweden: Lessons for America,” is available on YouTube as part of the Free to Choose Network. A short paper similarly titled, “Sweden’s Lesson for America,” has been published by the Cato Institute.

So I would recommend to all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle paying attention to either that video or that publication by Cato because we can learn a lot from Sweden, and it is not what people will be espousing here in the U.S. Senate based upon a lot of political speeches from those on the left.

As Norberg points out, by about 1950, Sweden was the fourth richest country in the world and had the fifth freest economy. In other words, Sweden became wealthy through economic freedom, like we have here in America. And then, you know what, Sweden started to adopt socialist policies.

At first, it was just a few welfare programs. But between 1960 and 1980, government spending in Sweden doubled from 31 percent of gross domestic product to 60 percent of gross domestic product, and, of course, that meant for all the people in Sweden to pay sky-high taxes.

This is the time period that older socialists remember so fondly and we see espoused here on the Senate floor. Sweden was surfing on top of the socialist wave and seemed to have it all: prosperity, massive government spending, and a highly regulated economy. However, even the best surfers cannot ride a wave forever. All waves eventually come crashing down. Sweden’s socialist policies started to kill off the wealth creation that had made its economy the fourth richest in the world. That wealth economy was needed to fund all that government spending.

Norberg points out that Sweden was 10 percent richer than the G7 countries on a per-capita basis in 1970. But 25 years later, 1995, it was more than 10 percent poorer than those same G7 countries. During that time, not a single job was created in Sweden’s private sector, and, more importantly, inflation took away almost all of the value